UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/316
22 September 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-ninth session
Item 63 (e) of the provisional agenda*

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT: TRANSPARENCY IN ARMAMENTS

Report on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development

Report of the Secretary-General

1. In its resolutions 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, 47/52 L of 15 December 1992 and 48/75 E of 16 December 1993, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts, on the continuing operation of the Register of Conventional Arms and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament and the views expressed by Member States, for submission to the General Assembly with a view to a decision by the Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

2. Pursuant to those resolutions, the Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the Assembly the report on the continuing operation of the Register of Conventional Arms and its further development.

* A/49/150.

94-32951 (E) 051094 061094

/...

ANNEX

Report on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	Page
FOREWORD BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL			4
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL			6
INTRODUCTION		1 - 8	10
	A. Principles	1 - 2	10
	B. Procedural	3 - 8	10
I.	REVIEW OF THE CONTINUING OPERATION OF THE REGISTER	9 - 29	12
	A. General	9 - 10	12
	B. Participation by Governments in the first two years of operation of the Register	11 - 21	12
	1. Overview	11 - 16	12
	2. Review of export and import data	17 - 20	14
	3. Submission of background information	21	16
	C. Conclusions	22 - 29	16
II.	FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGISTER	30 - 35	18
	A. General	30	18
	B. Adjustments to existing categories	31	18
	C. Addition of new categories	32 - 33	18
	D. Expansion of the scope	34 - 35	18
III.	REGIONAL ASPECTS	36 - 39	19

CONTENTS (continued)

		Paragraphs	Page
IV.	PROCEDURES	40 - 51	20
	A. Reporting formats	40 - 43	20
	1. General	40 - 41	20
	2. Standardized forms for reporting international transfers of conventional arms	42	20
	3. Available background information	43	21
	B. Contacts between Member States	44	21
	C. The role of the United Nations Secretariat	45 - 50	21
	D. Future reviews of the Register	51	22

Appendices

I.	Categories of equipment and their definitions	23
II.	Tables	25
III.	Reporting forms	27
	Annex 1. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (exports)	28
	Annex 2. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (imports)	30

FOREWORD BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

In my foreword to the 1992 report of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms, I observed that the Register could provide the United Nations with an effective instrument in preventive diplomacy. Now, with two years of experience in its operation, it is time to review and take stock. The attached report of the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts, adopted by consensus on 5 August, is part of that process. While endorsing this report, I would like to add some remarks of my own on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development.

As part of a larger international effort to promote openness and transparency in military matters, the Register contributes to confidence-building and security among States. The level of participation in the Register in the first two years has been encouraging. The provision of additional data and information by Governments, including that submitted by the major exporter States, has been an important expression of the commitment of States to the Register process. Nevertheless, wider participation by Governments, especially in certain regions and subregions, is of paramount importance if that process is to be further consolidated. Only in that way will the Register become a truly global instrument.

Some States do not see the relevance of the Register, in its current form, to their essential security interests. I would point out, however, that the Register is inherently flexible and that it has the capacity to expand its scope over time better to reflect the full military potential of States. I welcome the observations of the Group concerning the steps that might be taken in applicable forums to encourage regional approaches based on specific local conditions. At the same time, I fully concur that such approaches should complement and not detract from the universal instrument.

For my part, I believe that improved education and communication on the purposes of the Register, and its potential, are essential, and I will be taking steps to encourage moves in that direction. I call on regional and subregional groups and arrangements to assist me and promise them the support of the regional centres for peace and disarmament in that regard.

As I stated in 1992, I believe that the Register has the potential to be an effective instrument in preventive diplomacy. If the Register is to achieve its full potential, participation in it needs to be increased and the Register expanded in scope. I therefore concur with the recommendation that periodic reviews of the operation of the Register and its further development be conducted and that the General Assembly decide on the appropriate time for such reviews at an early date. Additionally, I believe that the Assembly needs to examine closely the mechanisms for such reviews, and I hope that, after three panels of governmental experts in 1991, 1992 and 1994, it will be able to agree on the most effective method of accomplishing this important task. I very much hope that Member States will seize the opportunities here to enhance confidence and transparency in military matters closely related to their legitimate security interests.

With these remarks, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the Group of Governmental Experts for preparing the present report, which is hereby submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

5 August 1994

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. The Group was appointed by you in pursuance of paragraph 11 (b) of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, paragraph 6 of resolution 47/52 L of 15 December 1992, and paragraph 3 of resolution 48/75 E of 16 December 1993, respectively.

The governmental experts were the following:

Mr. Alexander Akalovsky
Bureau of Multilateral Affairs
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Shawn Barber (third session)
Non-Proliferation, Arms Control and Disarmament Division
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
Ottawa, Canada

M. Jean-Paul Crédeville
Sous-Directeur du contrôle du commerce des matériels de défense
Ministère de la Dèfense
Dèlègation générale pour l'armement
Armées, France

Mr. Mitsuro Donowaki
Ambassador of Japan to Mexico
Mexico, D.F., Mexico

Major General (ret.) Ahmed Ismail Fakhr (first session)
Director
National Center for Middle East Studies
Cairo, Egypt

Ms. Zadalinda Gonzalez y Reynero
Minister
Alternate Representative of Mexico to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Paris, France

Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General of the United Nations
New York

/...

Mr. Rafael M. Grossi
First Secretary
Office of the Under-Secretary for Foreign Policy
Ministry of External Relations
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Mr. Paul Hatt
Director
Proliferation and Arms Control Secretariat
Ministry of Defence
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. Wolfgang Hoffmann
Representative of Germany to the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva, Switzerland

Mr. Ronald Huisken
Director, Policy Planning
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Canberra, Australia

Mr. Pauli Järvenpää
Department of Defence Policy
Ministry of Defence
Helsinki, Finland

Brigadier I. G. M. K. Kpeto (third session)
Office of the Chief of Staff
General Headquarters
Ghana Armed Forces
Burma Camp
Accra, Ghana

Mr. Piotr G. Litavrin
Head of Division
Department on Disarmament and Export Control
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Moscow, Russian Federation

Lt. Col. Ahmad Masarweh
Military Adviser
Permanent Mission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Antonino Lisboa Mena Gonçalves (first session)
Minister Counsellor to the Brazilian Embassy
Washington, D.C.

Lt. Col. José Rufino Menéndez Hernández
Ministry of Armed Forces
Havana, Cuba

Lt. Col. Mike N. Sango
Counsellor, Military Adviser
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zimbabwe to the United Nations
New York

Mr. SHA Zukang
Deputy Director
Department of International Organizations and Conferences
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Beijing, China

Brigadier General (ret.) Jonathan Shimshoni
Ministry of Defense
Israel

Mr. Sameh Shoukry (second and third sessions)
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Donald C. Sinclair (first and second sessions)
Deputy Director
Arms Control and Disarmament Division
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Rakesh Sood
Director
Disarmament and International Security Affairs Division
Ministry of External Affairs
New Delhi, India

Mr. Paulo Roberto Campos Tarrisse da Fontoura (second and third sessions)
First Secretary
Department of International Organizations
Ministry of External Affairs
Brasilia, Brazil

Mr. Shaukat Umer
Director-General (United Nations)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Islamabad, Pakistan

Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers
Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations
at Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland*

---

* As of September 1994, Ambassador of the Netherlands to Greece.

Lt. Col. YEO Kok Phuang
Ministry of Defense
Republic of Singapore

The report was prepared between 7 February and 5 August 1994. During that period the Group held three sessions in New York: the first from 7 to 11 February 1994, the second from 31 May to 10 June 1994, and the third from 25 July to 5 August 1994.

In carrying out its work, the Group took into account reports to the Register submitted by Governments for 1992 and 1993 and relevant documents related to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, as well as the views of Member States on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development in response to the invitation in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

The members of the Group wish to express their appreciation for the assistance they received from members of the Secretariat. They wish, in particular, to thank Mr. Prvoslav Davinić, Director, Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mrs. Hannelore Hoppe, who served as Secretary of the Group, and Mr. Edward Laurance, Mr. Terence Taylor and Mr. Herbert Wulf, who served in their private capacity as consultants to the Secretariat. The Group is also grateful to Mr. Marrack Goulding, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, for the support received from him throughout its work.

I have been requested by the Group of Governmental Experts, as its Chairman, to submit to you, on its behalf, the present report, which was unanimously approved. The expert of Egypt has reserved his position on the report.

(Signed) Hendrik WAGENMAKERS
Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

INTRODUCTION

A. Principles

1. On 9 December 1991, the General Assembly adopted resolution 46/36 L, entitled "Transparency in armaments", which established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and set out arrangements for the consideration of its development. The Assembly considered that an enhanced level of transparency in armaments could contribute to confidence-building and security among States. The establishment of the Register, as part of a larger family of international efforts to promote transparency in military matters, was a step in this direction and could prevent an excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms. All States Members of the United Nations were called upon to provide data to the Register on their transfers of seven categories of major conventional equipment, and were invited to provide background information on their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. Participation in the Register is a means through which States can signal their preparedness to enter into dialogue with other States on this aspect of security policy. This can provide a valuable input into bilateral and regional dialogues on security concerns and the evolution of a more cooperative approach to security. In this context, the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development underlined that the Register is not a control mechanism, but a confidence-building measure designed to improve security relations between States.

2. The Group recognized that the Register is not a stand-alone measure but should be regarded as a component in the efforts to promote confidence and transparency and to enhance security at the global and regional level. The Group, taking account of certain aspects of the work of the Conference on Disarmament, as well as views expressed by Member States and within the Group, observed that - notwithstanding that the Register deals with conventional weapons - the principle of transparency could also apply, in conjunction with other measures, to weapons of mass destruction and to transfers of high technology with military applications, as reflected in the provisions of various relevant international legal instruments and as indicated in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L. In this context, the Group noted the work undertaken by the Conference on Disarmament, as reflected in that resolution. That work is complementary to the goals of the Register.

B. Procedural

3. In resolution 46/36 L, the General Assembly requested that a panel of governmental technical experts and a group of governmental experts on the basis of equitable geographic representation be established. The task of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts, which was convened in 1992, was to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the Register of Conventional Arms; to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production; and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session. The Group of

Governmental Experts, convened in 1994, was asked to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament as set forth in resolution 46/36 L and the views expressed by Member States, for submission to the General Assembly with a view to a decision by the Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

4. On 14 August 1992, the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts established by the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L completed its report (A/47/342) and forwarded it to the Secretary-General. Part I of the report described the technical procedures and made adjustments to the annex of resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the Register. Part II, on modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register, covered the Panel's consideration of the modalities for the addition of further categories of equipment and the inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

5. The Secretary-General submitted the report of the Panel to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session. The Assembly, in its resolution 47/52 L, endorsed the recommendations contained in the report on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex to resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the Register. The Assembly also noted the suggestions offered in the report as a first step in the consideration of modalities for early expansion of the Register. It called upon all Member States to provide the data and information on imports and exports of arms to the Secretary-General by 30 April annually, beginning in 1993, and reaffirmed its request in resolution 46/36 L that the Secretary-General prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 1994.

6. On 11 October 1993, the Secretary-General transmitted to the General Assembly a report (A/48/344) containing data and information received from Governments for 1992, pursuant to the procedures established for the Register of Conventional Arms. The report of the first year of operation of the Register was welcomed by the General Assembly in resolution 48 /75 E. In that resolution, the Assembly again called upon Member States to provide data and information for the Register to the Secretary-General by 30 April annually and reaffirmed its request to the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 1994.

7. In the course of its deliberations, the Group of Governmental Experts had at its disposal the data and information submitted by Governments for the Register by 1 August 1994 for the calendar years 1992 and 1993.

8. The Group also had before it, and took into account, relevant documents related to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, as well as the views expressed by Member States on the operation of the Register and its further development in response to the invitation contained in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

I. REVIEW OF THE CONTINUING OPERATION OF THE REGISTER

A. General

9. The Group of Governmental Experts reviewed the operation of the Register in its first two years with a view to making recommendations for its consolidation and further development.

10. In its review of the continuing operation of the Register, the Group examined the data and information submitted by Member States from quantitative and qualitative perspectives. It also considered ways to enhance participation in the Register and to improve the clarity of the definitions of weapons and the efficacy of the reporting forms.

B. Participation by Governments in the first two years of operation of the Register

1. Overview

11. The Group considered that the 1992 and 1993 submissions indicated important patterns that related to its mandate to consider the further development of the Register, as described in the introduction to this report. It was encouraging that for the first time international arms transfers in the Register's seven categories of weapons were made more transparent through official data submitted by Member States. However, the Group recognized that two years represented limited experience and might be insufficient for confident conclusions regarding trends.

12. In addition to the technical and statistical analysis of the submissions, the Group stressed the value of the Register as a confidence- and security-building measure. The Group noted the importance of the commitment of Member States to the process that had begun with the first two years of the operation of the Register.

13. The objective of the Register is advanced by the widest possible participation of States. The Group was encouraged that the level of participation was one of the highest compared with similar international reporting instruments, such as the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures. The Group noted that the major exporters submitted data to the Register, thus covering the bulk of the international arms trade in the seven weapon categories. It also noted that many States that had neither exported nor imported arms in the relevant categories submitted "nil" reports; such reports are as important an expression of commitment to transparency as the submission of data on transfers and should be continued. By reducing uncertainty about the extent to which the Register covers all relevant transfers, the "nil" reports also improve the integrity of the Register. The Group was encouraged by the number of States that have recognized the relevance of such reports.

14. By 1 August 1994, 89 submissions had been received for 1992 and 77 for 1993. The Group noted that reports for both years were still being submitted

despite the request to report by 30 April annually for the preceding calendar year. In order to make a fair comparison of the two years of reporting to date, the Group decided to review the situation on the basis of the number of reports submitted by Governments by 1 August in 1993 and 1 August 1994 for the respective prior calendar years. By 1 August 1993, 71 Governments had submitted reports for 1992, and by 1 August 1994, 77 Governments had submitted reports for 1993. The level of participation in each of these two first reporting years was similar. However, notwithstanding that there was a wide coverage of the total international arms trade, less than half the States Members of the United Nations have participated in the Register. Observance of the date by which the reporting is requested is important for the effectiveness of the Register and in order that the Secretary-General can submit the annual consolidated report on the Register to the General Assembly promptly and in due form.

Submissions by Governments*

		1992 (by 1 August 1993)	1993 (by 1 August 1994)
		Number of Member States	Number of Member States
Total number of participants		71**	77
Exports:	data submitted	23	21
	"nil" reports	36	48
	no data given	12	8
		Total: 71	Total: 77
Imports:	data submitted	32	28
	"nil" reports	28	44
	no data given	11	5
		Total: 71 (39 per cent of United Nations Members)	Total: 77 (42 per cent of United Nations Members)

* Except where otherwise indicated, for the purpose of this report, the submission by the Government of Switzerland, which is not a member of the United Nations, is included.

** By 1 August 1994, the total number of States submitting returns for 1992 was 89 (see appendix II, table 1).

15. As at 1 August 1994, 61 of the 89 Governments that reported for 1992 also reported for 1993. The Group observed that 28 of the 89 Governments that reported for 1992 had not yet done so for 1993, and 16 Governments that had not reported for 1992 had done so for 1993.

16. In both years, the degree of participation in the Register varied widely but fairly consistently among regions, as shown in the table below in which countries are divided according to the five United Nations regional groups.

Submission by Governments*

Regional group	1992** (by 1 August 1993)	1993 (by 1 August 1994)	Percent of participation in the group 1992	1993
African States	6 of 51	9 of 52	12	17
Asian States	15 of 47	19 of 47	32	40
Eastern European States	11 of 19	11 of 20	58	55
Latin American and Caribbean States	11 of 33	11 of 33	33	33
Western European and other States	24 of 24	24 of 27	100	89
Other States (not members of any group)	3 of 5	2 of 5	60	40

* For this particular table, the submission of the Government of Switzerland is not included.

** Details on participation for 1992 received after 1 August 1993 are contained in appendix II, table 2.

2. Review of export and import data

17. A number of Member States (28 for 1992, 22 for 1993), identified by exporting States as recipients of arms in the seven categories covered by the Register, did not report or participate in the Register. A few Member States (two for 1992 and none for 1993) were identified on import forms as exporters but did not participate in the Register. The data below indicate that more transfers were reported on export forms than on import forms. The data reveal that 16 States reported both exports and imports in 1992 while 10 did so for 1993.

	1992 (by 1 August 1993)	1993 (by 1 August 1994)
Transfers reported on export forms	157	149
Transfers reported on import forms	120	86

18. A comparison of export and import reports revealed four types of cases (for details see appendix II, table 4:

Type A - The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer and the number of items matched;

Type B - The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer but the number of items reported did not match;

Type C - The transfer was reported by only the exporter or importer, since the other party participated in the Register process but did not report this particular transfer;

Type D - The transfer was reported by only the exporter or importer, since the other party did not participate in the Register process.

The Group noted that in a significant number of instances, for both 1992 and 1993, the data supplied by exporters and importers for a given transaction did not match. As at 1 August 1994, data in submissions by exporters and the respective importers on their transfers matched for 30 per cent of the cases for 1992 and 22 per cent for 1993 (Type A). Overall, the data reveal a significant percentage of mismatches or discrepancies in the reports of States reporting exports and imports.

19. The Group observed that the returns for 1993 showed a substantial increase over 1992, in several weapon categories, in the total number of weapons systems transferred globally, as reflected in the data submitted by the major exporters (see appendix II, table 3). The Group noted, however, that two years of data were not sufficient to draw conclusions regarding long-term trends. In fact, assessing the significance of any trend in arms transfers would require, inter alia, analysis of the data in the context of regions and the procurement of weapons through national production.

20. The reporting forms include a "Remarks" column allowing Governments, at their discretion, to supplement the numerical data with some descriptive comments on the transfers reported. In 1992, 16 of 23 States reporting exports opted to use the "Remarks" column of the form. Thirteen of 20 States reporting exports did so in 1993. Twenty-three out of 32 States reporting imports used the "Remarks" column for that purpose in 1992, and 22 Member States out of 29 did so in 1993. In the Group's view, the use of the "Remarks" column facilitates understanding of the data provided. There was no agreement within the Group to incorporate the "Remarks" column in the reporting forms at the same level of commitment as for transfers.

3. Submission of background information

21. Thirty-three States submitted available background information for 1992; the figure for 1993, as at 1 August 1994, was 28 Member States. Information on military holdings was submitted by 22 Member States for 1992, and 24 for 1993, as at 1 August 1994. Information on procurement through national production was provided by 14 countries for 1992, and 17 for 1993, as at 1 August 1994. Although it was too early to assess longer-term trends, the Group noted that both for data on military holdings and procurement through national production, the number of States submitting such information had grown somewhat. The Group observed that most States providing this information used the same categories as for transfers. Many of these States also reported on their security and/or arms-transfers policies.

C. Conclusions

22. In reviewing the operation of the Register in its first two years, the Group concluded that, although there was a significant level of continuity in reporting to the Register, wider participation leading to universal participation by Member States is of paramount importance. States should be encouraged to participate in the Register by submitting a return, including a "nil" report if they have neither exported nor imported equipment in the Register categories during the calendar year. The Group was aware of the requirements for States to take into account the legitimate security needs of States and the principle of undiminished security. States should be encouraged to provide data in a timely manner so as to enable the Secretary-General to publish the consolidated report on the Register promptly.

23. The Group noted that in the first two years of operation of the Register, participation varied widely among regions, which may have been due to, inter alia, differences in the security environments and concerns of the States involved. These issues are further discussed under regional aspects below. In order to promote wider participation in the Register, a regional approach may be beneficial in increasing participation in this confidence-building measure. In this connection, the Group took note of relevant initiatives of some regional organizations or forums. Those activities could address various possible concerns of non-participating States, such as relevance of the Register to their region, as well as national laws and regulations. At the same time, the Group stressed the importance of the United Nations regional centres on peace and disarmament in facilitating the efforts carried out by regional organizations or forums aimed at promoting the Register.

24. The Group noted that more transactions were reported on export than on import forms, both in 1992 and 1993. The Group was of the view that the number of mismatches and discrepancies between the data submitted by exporters and importers is a matter of concern. One reason for discrepancies was non-participation in the Register by one of the parties to the transactions reported. Consequently, in both years roughly 30 per cent of the transfers reported to the Register could not be cross-checked because of non-participation by the importing State. The Group observed that this non-participation could be

due to, inter alia, unfamiliarity with the Register procedures or possible security concerns.

25. For those transfers which were reported by exporting and importing States, among the reasons for mismatches may have been conflicting interpretations of whether or not a transfer had occurred. One area that caused confusion in this regard was licensed or collaborative production. The Group felt that another reason may have been conflicting interpretations of the definitions of categories of equipment. Judging by the data submitted, a further reason for mismatches was errors in reporting, such as a few instances where data on procurement through national production and military holdings were submitted as imports. Consequently, in both years, roughly 40 per cent of the transfers reported to the Register could not be matched. The Group expressed the hope that greater familiarity by Member States with reporting to, and operation of, the Register would over time reduce those sources of mismatched data.

26. In a few cases, States reported transfers to United Nations peace-keeping forces. The Group judged that such transfers fall outside the purposes of the Register. Member States wishing to report such transfers should indicate the special circumstances by using the "Remarks" column.

27. The Group believed that discrepancies also arose because of conflicting interpretations as to when a transfer occurred. An example was the supplier deeming a weapon to have been exported under its own national criteria while the recipient did not consider the import to have been concluded. A universally agreed definition of an arms transfer would reduce the number of discrepancies, as well as mismatches, and greatly enhance the efficient operation of the Register. The differing legal and administrative practices of States have prevented, at least at this stage, such an objective from being achieved. None the less, efforts to evolve such a global definition, for the purpose of the Register, should continue. Once achieved, this would represent an important improvement. For the time being, the most practical approach remains a comprehensive description, as set out in paragraph 42 below, of the main elements of an arms transfer. It has to be acknowledged that the use of such a description has not so far proved entirely satisfactory. As noted above, this is one of the reasons for the inconsistencies observed between import and export data submitted by Member States. The Group therefore concluded that there could be some improvement in understanding the nature of these inconsistencies if Member States, when submitting their returns, indicated their national criteria used for determining when a transfer had occurred.

28. In the course of its deliberations, the Group was aware that the reasons for some of the mismatches and discrepancies in the returns to the Register had been addressed through bilateral discussion. Such contacts, if deemed appropriate, between exporting and importing States regarding technical difficulties shown in their reports may improve the effectiveness of the Register. As the case may be, States are encouraged to inform the Secretary-General of the outcome of such contacts.

29. In order to contribute to greater clarity and understanding of how to complete the reporting forms as they currently exist, the Group felt that there was room for some technical improvements as described in paragraphs 40-42.

II. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGISTER

A. General

30. In the view of the Group the question of the further development of the Register had three dimensions to be considered: adjustments to the existing definitions for the seven categories of equipment; the addition of new categories of conventional weapons; and the early expansion of the scope of the Register as called for in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

B. Adjustments to existing categories

31. With regard to the question of possible adjustments to the existing definitions of the seven categories, the Group had before it a number of proposals, none of which commanded complete support. The definitions could be reviewed again at a later date.

C. Addition of new categories

32. With respect to the addition of new categories of conventional weapons to the existing seven categories, the Group had before it a number of proposals, including those listed in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (A/47/342, annex, para. 40), none of which commanded complete support. The Group felt that this matter should be kept under review.

33. The Chairman of the Group received a letter from the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs suggesting that the Group consider adding anti-personnel land-mines as a new category to the Register. The Group recognized the terrible suffering, injuries and deaths caused by the misuse of anti-personnel mines, but felt that the Register was not the appropriate mechanism to deal with this problem. The Register is designed as a confidence-building measure to contribute to the efforts aimed at preventing destabilizing accumulations of major conventional weapons beyond the quantity needed for legitimate self-defence. The Group's view was that the issue of anti-personnel mines is largely one of international legal regulation.

D. Expansion of the scope

34. With regard to the third dimension, the expansion of the scope of the Register, a building block had already been put in place by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/36 L, in which the Assembly invited Member States, "pending the expansion of the Register, also to provide to the Secretary-General, with their annual report on imports and exports of arms, available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies". A number of Member States submitted such information, as indicated in paragraph 21 above, with most of them providing such information on the seven categories covered by the Register; in so doing, many of them used forms derived from those on transfers.

35. The Group considered the issue of expansion of the Register, as called for in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, to include military holdings and procurement through national production. It took into account the first two years of experience, the views of Member States and the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Following this consideration, the Group reaffirmed the goal of early expansion of the Register by inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production but could reach no agreement for such inclusion on the same basis as for transfers. The Group had before it several other proposals relating to the expansion of the scope of the Register, none of which commanded complete support. It agreed that further consideration of this issue was required.

III. REGIONAL ASPECTS

36. Earlier in this report, in its review of the continuing operation of the Register, the Group noted that some regions of the world participated in the Register more than others during the first two years of operation, which may have been due to, inter alia, differences in the security environments and concerns of States in various regions.

37. In resolutions 46/36 L and 48/75 E, the General Assembly called upon all Member States to "cooperate at a regional and subregional level, taking fully into account the specific conditions prevailing in the region or subregion, with a view to enhancing and coordinating international efforts aimed at increased openness and transparency in armaments".

38. The Group felt that such regional and subregional efforts should be encouraged. They may pave the way towards a higher degree of openness, confidence and transparency in the region, thereby promoting greater participation in the Register. Such regional efforts should complement and not detract from the operation of the universal and global United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

39. As mentioned in paragraph 23, the various regional forums could address the possible regional security concerns relating to participation in the Register. The Group noted that the problem of some types of conventional weapons, including small arms, not covered by the categories of the Register, was referred to by some States as one of the reasons for the lack of participation in the Register. The Group considered that such a specific problem should be addressed primarily among States in the regions or subregions concerned.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Reporting formats

1. General

40. Appendix A contains the seven categories of equipment and their definitions to be used for reporting transfers to the Register. It confirms the categories of equipment and their definitions contained in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (ibid., para. 14).

41. Appendix III contains two forms with explanatory notes which Member States are requested to complete when submitting data pursuant to the operating procedures of the Register. The two forms are: (1) the standardized form of reporting international transfers of conventional arms: exports; and (2) the standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms: imports.

2. Standardized forms for reporting international transfers of conventional arms

42. In determining what to report, Member States should take into account the following descriptions of arms transfers, as set forth in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (ibid., paras. 10-13):

(a) International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment;

(b) An international arms transfer may also occur without the movement of equipment across State frontiers if a State, or its agent, is granted title and control over the equipment in the territory of the supplier State. Therefore, a transfer of arms to a State would occur when its forces stationed abroad are granted title and control of equipment by the host country or any third State, or when title and control of such equipment are transferred to the host country or any third State. Additionally, if title and control of equipment temporarily stored or prepositioned on the territory of another State are granted to the host country by the owner, then an international transfer has occurred;

(c) Since the supply of equipment by a State to units of its armed forces stationed abroad does not involve transfer of national title and control, such supply is not considered an international transfer. Equipment of a State can be temporarily stored or prepositioned on the territory of another State with no transfer of title and control of this equipment. This is not considered an international transfer;

(d) Member States are requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year. To be reported are those transfers considered by States to have been effected during the relevant reporting year, in conformity with their respective national criteria used to define when a transfer becomes

effective. Member States are invited to indicate such national criteria with their return.

3. Available background information

43. In its resolution 46/36 L, the General Assembly also invited Member States to include with their return available background information on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. Under that resolution, Member States were invited to provide such information in any form they wished.

B. Contacts between Member States

44. The Group took note of the contacts that had taken place between some reporting States during the first two years of operation of the Register in order to avoid mismatches and discrepancies in data reported to the Register. The Group believed that such contacts, a posteriori, could improve the clarity and understanding of reports to the Register.

C. The role of the United Nations Secretariat

45. The role of the United Nations, in particular the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, in respect to the maintenance and operation of the Register was clearly defined in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (ibid., paras. 23 and 25 to 33). Accordingly, the report of the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session (A/48/344) contained in consolidated form the replies of Governments as received by the Secretariat. The report also contained an index of the background information submitted by Governments on a voluntary basis. In this context, the Group noted that the Secretariat, in order to comply as much as practicable with General Assembly resolutions regarding the length of Assembly documentation, only included those standardized forms containing specific data and notes verbales of Governments providing relevant information. All other information was summarized in the composite table contained in the Secretary-General's report (ibid., para. 10).

46. The data and information provided to the Register by Governments have been stored in the computerized database which was established pursuant to the recommendation of the 1992 Panel and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 47/52 L. The Group noted the efforts of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs to provide Member States with access to the computerized data contained in the Register by physical transfers of diskettes. At the same time, the Group believed that further emphasis could be placed on providing for access by Member States to on-line data.

47. The background information provided by Governments is available in the library of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs for consultation. A running index of that information is maintained in the database. The Group believed that background information provided by Governments should continue to be kept in the

library of the Centre and should be accessible to the public, after the publication of the consolidated report of the Secretary-General.

48. The first two years of operation of the Register saw some differences in interpretation of definitions, as well as discrepancies and mismatches in some of the data reported. Taking into account the different formats and manner in which the information was submitted to the Register, the Group recommended that, when requested, the Secretariat continue to advise Member States on technical aspects of participation in the Register to help reduce technical errors. In the Group's view, the responsibility of the Secretariat for the correct and efficient management of data and information would contribute to further enhancing the objectives of the Register.

49. The Group commended the Centre for Disarmament Affairs on its efforts to assist Member States in understanding the reporting requirements for the Register. In that respect, the holding of workshops for the Asian-Oceania region, Latin America and the Caribbean, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East jointly organized by the Centre with the generous support of Member States (Argentina, Canada, Italy, Japan and Poland) during 1993 was considered important. The workshops also provided an initial framework for promoting the Register at the regional level. The Group believed that the services of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, if requested, could contribute to bilateral and regional contacts.

50. The Group welcomed approval by the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session of the establishment of three additional posts in relation to the Register.

D. Future reviews of the Register

51. The Group considered it important that periodic reviews of the continuing operation of the Register and its further development be conducted. The Group recommended that the General Assembly decide on the appropriate time for such reviews to take place at an early date.

APPENDIX I

Categories of equipment and their definitions

This appendix, listing the seven categories of equipment and their definitions to be used for reporting transfers to the Register, confirms the categories of equipment and their definitions contained in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (A/47/342, annex, para. 14).

I. Battle tanks

Tracked or wheeled self-propelled armoured fighting vehicles with high cross-country mobility and a high level of self-protection, weighing at least 16.5 metric tonnes unladen weight, with a high muzzle velocity direct fire main gun of at least 75 millimetres calibre.

II. Armoured combat vehicles

Tracked, semi-tracked or wheeled self-propelled vehicles, with armoured protection and cross-country capability, either: (a) designed and equipped to transport a squad of four or more infantrymen, or (b) armed with an integral or organic weapon of at least 12.5 millimetres calibre or a missile launcher.

III. Large calibre artillery systems

Guns, howitzers, artillery pieces, combining the characteristics of a gun or a howitzer, mortars or multiple-launch rocket systems, capable of engaging surface targets by delivering primarily indirect fire, with a calibre of 100 millimetres and above.

IV. Combat aircraft

Fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons, or other weapons of destruction, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized electronic warfare, suppression of air defence or reconnaissance missions. The term "combat aircraft" does not include primary trainer aircraft, unless designed, equipped or modified as described above.

V. Attack helicopters

Rotary-wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided or unguided anti-armour, air-to-surface, air-to-subsurface, or air-to-air weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized reconnaissance or electronic warfare missions.

VI. Warships

Vessels or submarines armed and equipped for military use with a standard displacement of 750 metric tonnes or above, and those with a standard displacement of less than 750 metric tonnes, equipped for launching missiles with a range of at least 25 kilometres or torpedoes with similar range.

VII. Missiles and missile launchers

Guided or unguided rockets, ballistic or cruise missiles capable of delivering a warhead or weapon of destruction to a range of at least 25 kilometres, and means designed or modified specifically for launching such missiles or rockets, if not covered by categories I through VI. For the purpose of the Register, this category:

(a) Also includes remotely piloted vehicles with the characteristics for missiles as defined above;

(b) Does not include ground-to-air missiles.

APPENDIX II

Tables

Table 1. Participation of Member States - 1992 (by 1 August 1994)

Number of Member States

Exports:	data submitted	24
	"nil" report	48
	no data given	17
Imports:	data submitted	38
	"nil" reports	38
	no data given	13
	Total:	89
	(47 per cent of United Nations Members)	

Table 2. Distribution by United Nations regional groups (by 1 August 1994)

	Submissions by Governments*		Percentage of participation in the group	
	1992	1993	1992	1993
African States	10 of 51	9 of 52	20	17
Asian States	22 of 47	19 of 47	47	40
Eastern European States	14 of 19	11 of 20	74	55
Latin American and Caribbean States	15 of 33	11 of 33	45	33
Western European and other States	24 of 24	24 of 27	100	89
Other States (not member of any group)	3 of 5	2 of 5	60	40

* For this particular table, the submission of the Government of Switzerland is not included.

Table 3. Transfers of items in the seven Register categories

	Exports		Imports	
	1992	1993	1992	1993
Battle tanks	1 719	2 921	1 091	1 422
Armoured combat vehicles	1 529	2 060	516	956
Large calibre artillery systems	1 538	386	869	1 312
Combat aircraft	253	351	170	267
Attack helicopters	18	117	17	88
Warships	19	31	23	29
Missiles and missile launchers	67 833	4 506	8 749	1 165

Table 4: Cross-checking data

(a) The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer and the number of items matched:

1992: 30 per cent of transfers reported
1993: 22 per cent of transfers reported

(b) The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer but the number of items reported did not match:

1992: 8 per cent of the transfers reported
1993: 9 per cent of the transfers reported

(c) The transfer was reported by only the exporter or importer, since the other party participated in the Register process but did not report this particular transfer:

1992: 31 per cent of the transfers reported
1993: 36 per cent of the transfers reported

(d) The transfer was reported by only the exporter or importer, since the other party did not participate in the Register process:

1992: 31 per cent of the transfers reported
1993: 33 per cent of the transfers reported

APPENDIX III

Reporting forms

1. Member States wishing to submit data to the Register of Conventional Arms should use the two forms which follow, so as to facilitate reporting. Guidelines for the completion of these forms are contained in paragraph 42 and appendix I of this report. Member States are invited to provide with their return the information requested in the explanatory notes which accompany the forms.

2. The two forms are:

1. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms: exports;

2. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms: imports.

Annex 1. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms a/

EXPORTS
Report of international conventional arms transfers
(according to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: _____
Calendar year:

A	B	C	D b/	E b/	Remarks c/	
Category (I-VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
II. Armoured combat vehicles	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
III. Large calibre artillery systems	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
IV. Combat aircraft	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
V. Attack helicopters	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
VI. Warships	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
VII. Missiles and missile launchers d/	1)					
	2)					
	3)					

a/, b/, c/, d/ See explanatory notes.

The nature of information provided should be indicated in accordance with explanatory notes e and f.

Explanatory notes

a/ Member States that do not have anything to report should file a "nil report" clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the categories during the reporting period.

b/ International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment. Member States are invited to provide with their return a concise explanation of national criteria used to determine when an arms transfer becomes effective. (See paragraph 42 of the report of the Group).

c/ In the "Remarks" column Member States may wish to describe the item transferred by entering the designation, type, model or any other information considered relevant. Member States may also wish to use the "Remarks" column to explain or clarify aspects relevant to the transfer.

d/ Multiple-launch rocket systems are covered by the definition of category III. Rockets qualifying for registration are covered under category VII. (See appendix I.)

e/ Check any of the following provided as part of your submission:

		Check
(i)	Annual report on exports of arms	-
(ii)	Annual report on imports of arms	-
(iii)	Available background information on military holdings	-
(iv)	Available background information on procurement through national production	-
(v)	Available background information on relevant policies and/or national legislation	-
(vi)	Other (please describe)	-

f/ When reporting transfers, which of the following criteria, drawn from paragraph 42 of the report of the Group, were used:

		Check
(i)	Departure of equipment from the exporter's territory	-
(ii)	Arrival of equipment in the importer's territory	-
(iii)	Transfer of title	-
(iv)	Transfer of control	-
(v)	Others (please provide brief description below)	-

Annex 2. Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms a/

IMPORTS
Report of international conventional arms transfers
(according to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: _____
Calendar year:

A	B	C	D b/	E b/	Remarks c/	
Category (I-VII)	Exporter State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
II. Armoured combat vehicles	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
III. Large calibre artillery systems	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
IV. Combat aircraft	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
V. Attack helicopters	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
VI. Warships	1)					
	2)					
	3)					
VII. Missiles and missile launchers d/	1)					
	2)					
	3)					

a/, b/, c/, d/ See explanatory notes.

The nature of information provided should be indicated in accordance with explanatory notes e and f.

Explanatory notes

a/ Member States that do not have anything to report should file a "nil report" clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the categories during the reporting period.

b/ International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment. Member States are invited to provide with their return a concise explanation of national criteria used to determine when an arms transfer becomes effective. (See paragraph 42 of the report of the Group.)

c/ In the "Remarks" column Member States may wish to describe the item transferred by entering the designation, type, model or any other information considered relevant. Member States may also wish to use the "Remarks" column to explain or clarify aspects relevant to the transfer.

d/ Multiple-launch rocket systems are covered by the definition of category III. Rockets qualifying for registration are covered under category VII. (See appendix I.)

e/ Check any of the following provided as part of your submission:

		Check
(i)	Annual report on exports of arms	-
(ii)	Annual report on imports of arms	-
(iii)	Available background information on military holdings	-
(iv)	Available background information on procurement through national production	-
(v)	Available background information on relevant policies and/or national legislation	-
(vi)	Other (please describe)	-

f/ When reporting transfers, which of the following criteria, drawn from paragraph 42 of the report of the Group, were used:

		Check
(i)	Departure of equipment from the exporter's territory	-
(ii)	Arrival of equipment in the importer's territory	-
(iii)	Transfer of title	-
(iv)	Transfer of control	-
(v)	Others (please provide brief description below)	-